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# NC

The environment is not an intrinsically valuable good. Only agents are intrinsically valuable; facts about the world only have value relative to agents. Hill[[1]](#footnote-1):

The second argument is roughly this: **Most valuable things[']** have value only because valued [sic] by human beings. Their **value is derivative from the fact that they serve our interests** and desires**. Even pleasure, which we value for its own sake, has** only derivative value, that is, **value dependent on the contingent fact that human beings want it**. Now if valuers confer derivative value on things by their preferences and choices, those **valuers must themselves have value**. In fact, they must have value **independent of**, and superior to, **the derivative values which they create**. The guiding analogy is how we treat *ends*. We value certain means because they serve intermediate ends, which in turn we value because they contribute to our ultimate ends, that is, what we value for its own sake. The value of the means and the intermediate means is derivative from the value of the ultimate ends; unless we value the ultimate end, the means and intermediate ends would be worthless to us. So, it seems, the source of derivative value must be valuable for its own sake. Since **the ultimate source of the value of our contingent ends,** such as health, wealth, and even pleasure, **is their being valued by human beings**, human beings, as valuers, must be valued for their own sakes**.**

To say that an object could have value that is non-derivative from humans valuing them is just to say that that object has some objective, non-relational value-making property. These properties are only perceptible through intuition, but our intuitions about the environment are unclear. Hill 2:

Early in this century, due largely to the influence of G. E. Moore, another point of view developed which some may find promising.4 Moore introduced, or at least made popular, the idea that certain states of affairs are intrinsically valuable—not just valued, but valuable, and not necessarily because of their effects on sentient beings. Admittedly Moore came to believe that in fact the only intrinsically valuable things were conscious experiences of various sorts,5 but this restriction was not inherent in the idea of intrinsic value. The **intrinsic goodness** of something, he thought, was **[is] an objective, nonrelational property of the thing,** like *its* texture or color, **but not a property perceivable by sense perception** or *detectable by* scientific instruments. In theory at least, a single tree thriving alone in a universe without sentient beings, and even without God, could be intrinsically valuable. Since, according to Moore, our duty is to maximize intrinsic value, his theory could obviously be used to argue that we have reason not to destroy natural environments independently of how they affect human beings and animals. The survival of a forest might have worth beyond its worth to sentient beings. This approach, like the religious one, may appeal to some but is infested with problems. There are, first, the familiar objections to intuitionism, on which the theory depends. Metaphysical and epistemological doubts about **nonnatural, intuited properties are** hard to suppress, and many have argued that the theory rests on a misunderstanding of the words good, valuable, and the like.6 Second, even if we try to set aside these objections and think in Moore’s terms, it is far from obvious that everyone would agree *that* the existence of forests, *etc.,* is intrinsically valuable. The test, says Moore, is **[determined by] what we would say when we imagine a universe with just the thing *in question,* without any effects or accompaniments, and then *we* ask, “Would its existence be better than its nonexistence?”** Be careful, Moore would remind us, not to construe this ques- tion as, “Would you prefer the existence of that universe to its nonexistence?” **The question is, “Would its existence have the objective, nonrelational prop- erty, intrinsic goodness?”** Now even among those who have no worries about whether this really makes sense, **[With the environment,] we** might **well get a diversity of answers. Those prone to destroy** natural **environments will** doubtless **give one answer,** and **nature lovers** will likely give **another.** When an issue is as controversial as the one at hand, intuition is a poor arbiter.

Thus, the environment is not intrinsically valuable. If there are any valid norms governing the use of non-intrinsic goods, the norms governing the free use of those goods must be fairly applied to all agents. First, since there are no *a priori* morally relevant differences between agents, it is incoherent to think that there are legitimate constraints over the use of resources, *and* that those constraints should advantage one agent’s use of those resources over another’s. Second, morality must serve as a guide to action, and it can only guide action if agents would rationally accept it. It is not rationally acceptable to allow a rule that would constrain oneself in one situation but that did not constrain others at the relevant time, so one cannot accept a rule that applies inconsistently given a mere difference in time and location. Thus, **my burden is to show that prioritizing environmental protection over resource extraction when the two conflict is not a principle that could be fairly applied to all agents.**

I contend that in prioritizing a non-intrinsic good the aff enforces an unfair principle of action on status quo developing by depriving them of the opportunity to exploit their natural resources. At some point in their development, currently developed countries had the opportunity to exploit their natural resources in order to develop. Barbier[[2]](#footnote-2) ‘11 **IntroductionThroughout** much of **history**, **a** **critical** driving **force behind** global economic **development** has **been the response** of society **to** the scarcity of key **natural resources**, such as land, forests, fish, fossil fuels and minerals.  Increasing scarcity raises the cost of exploiting existing natural resources and creates incentives in all economies to innovate and conserve.  However, economies have also responded to increasing scarcity by obtaining and developing more abundant sources of natural resources.  Since the agricultural transition over 12,000 years ago, this exploitation of new “frontiers” has often proved to be a pivotal human response to natural resource scarcity.For example, **before the Industrial Revolution** (ca. 1775), finding and **exploiting** new frontiers of land and **natural resources were fundamental to** successful economic **development** and **seen as an** important **objective of conquering** and occupying new **lands**, **monopolizing** **trade** links**, and colonizing** and populating other regions of **the world**.  However, since the Industrial Revolution and certainly over the last century, supplies of strategic raw material, mineral and energy commodities have become so cheaply available through global trade that natural resource scarcity is no longer viewed as an economic constraint.  Technological applications to land, fisheries, forests and other natural resource endowments have become sufficiently productive and routine that we believe that human ingenuity and innovations can overcome any resource scarcity problem.**“If humankind is to succeed in overcoming these global problems, we need to find the next “new frontiers” of natural resources and adapt economic development accordingly.”**Today, we are on the verge of a new era, the “Age of Ecological Scarcity”. For the first time in history, fossil fuel energy and raw material use, environmental degradation and pollution may be occurring on such an unprecedented scale that the resulting consequences in terms of global warming, ecological scarcity and energy insecurity are generating worldwide impacts. If humankind is to succeed in overcoming these global problems, we need to find the next “new frontiers” of natural resources and adapt economic development accordingly. This will require developing low-carbon sources of energy, processes of production and technological innovation that require less environmental degradation and pollution. It will also mean instigating institutional changes, creating global carbon and environmental markets, and implementing new policies to foster a new era of “sustainable” economic development.History has shown that such changes in response to scarcity have occurred before, and those economies that have instigated the transformation first have emerged as leaders.  The question remains, however, how will the world economy respond to the economic and environmental challenges of the Age of Ecological Scarcity?It may be too early to answer this question, but we can gain some insights into how the world shouldrespond by examining the main factors underlying successful resource-based development in the past.**Lessons from history**A key misunderstanding about the role that natural resources play in economic development is that they are often treated as naturally occurring “fixed” endowments.  That is, countries are either “lucky”, and are endowed with abundant sources of valuable natural resources, or they are “unlucky”, and have very little resources or poor quality natural wealth.  In fact, exploiting or converting new sources of relative abundant resources for production purposes can be a dynamic process that causes economies to “take off”.  Years ago, the economist Joseph Schumpeter suggested that this process often contributes fundamentally to economic development, which he defined as “the carrying out of new combinations of the means of production”, one of which is “the conquest of a new source of supply of raw materials…irrespective of whether this source already exists or whether it has first to be created”.1**“Exploiting or converting new sources of relative abundant resources for production purposes can be a dynamic process that causes economies to “take off.”**Various examples of successful resource-based development, from the late 19th century to the present, highlight the three key factors in this process. First, country-specific knowledge and technical applications in the resource extraction sector can effectively expand what appears to be a “fixed” resource endowment of a country. For example, the economic historians Gavin Wright and Jesse Czelusta document this process for several successful mineral-based economies over the past 30 to 40 years: “From the standpoint of development policy, a crucial aspect of the process is the role of country-specific knowledge.  Although the deep scientific bases for progress are undoubtedly global, it is in the nature of geology that location-specific knowledge continues to be important….the experience of the 1970s stands in marked contrast to the 1990s, when mineral production steadily expanded primarily as a result of purposeful exploration and ongoing advances in the technologies of search, extraction, refining, and utilization; in other words by a process of learning.”2Second, there must be strong linkages between the resource sector and frontier-based activities and the rest of the economy.  For example, **the origins of** rapid industrial and **economic expansion in the U**nited **S**tates over 1879-1940 **were strongly linked to** the **exploitation of** abundant non-reproducible **natural resources**, particularly energy and mineral resources. “Not only was the USA the world’s leading mineral economy in the very historical period during which the country became the world leader in manufacturing (roughly from 1890 to 1910); but linkages and complementarities to the resource sector were vital in the broader story of American economic success….**Nearly all** major US manufactured **goods were closely linked to the** **resource economy** in one way or another: petroleum products, primary copper, meat packing and poultry, steel works and rolling mills, coal mining, vegetable oils, grain mill products, sawmill products, and so on”.3**Such linkages were essential in promoting** successful “staples-based” **development in many economies during** **the 1870-1914 era**: “not all resource-rich countries succeeded in spreading the growth impulses from their primary sectors….in a number of instances the staples sector turned out to be an enclave with little contact with the rest of the economy….The staples theory of growth stresses the development of linkages between the export sector and an incipient manufacturing sector.”4Third, there must be substantial knowledge spillovers arising from the extraction and use of resources and land in the economy.  For example, Wright and his fellow economic historian Paul David suggest that the rise of the American minerals-based economy from 1879 to 1940 can also be attributed to the infrastructure of public scientific knowledge, mining education and the “ethos of exploration”.  This in turn created knowledge spillovers across firms and “the components of successful modern-regimes of knowledge-based economic growth. In essential respects, the minerals economy was an integral part of the emerging knowledge-based economy of the twentieth century….increasing returns were manifest at the national level, with important consequences for American industrialization and world economic leadership.”5 Wright and Czelusta cite the development of the US petrochemical industry to illustrate the economic importance of knowledge spillovers: “Progress in petrochemicals is an example of new technology built on resource-based heritage.  It may also be considered a return to scale at the industry level, because the search for by-products was an outgrowth of the vast American enterprise of petroleum refining.”6There are **many historical examples** from eras other than the 19th and 20th century that also **fit the** above **conditions for** successful **resource-based development**.This is certainly true for the Sung Dynasty in China from 960 to 1279.  Military conquest ensured that Sung China had amassed a huge “internal frontier” of agricultural land and other abundant natural resources, such as iron ore, coal, timber, fuelwood, salt, fish and metals.  But Sung rulers did not just exploit these frontiers for windfall gains; they also invested the tax revenues earned from frontier expansion into developing canals, waterways and an effective inland transport system, as well as innovations in flood control and irrigated paddy rice production.  These developments in turn fostered substantial floodplain and lowland arable land expansion throughout southern China, which sustained large increases in agricultural productivity as well as population growth.  Tax revenues earned from the increased agricultural production funded further public works investments.  Cheap and safe waterway transport facilitated long-distance marketing of agricultural products and induced further agricultural expansion into new frontier areas.  New rice and sugar varieties were imported and cultivated in tropical southern China, suitable for both irrigated paddy and rainfed cultivation.  These varieties allowed dryland rice farming to spread into hilly terrain, doubling cultivated area.  By developing its abundant coal resources and blast furnace technology, a large iron industry grew in northern China, allowing the manufacture of weapons, farm implements and tools.  Other technological innovations spurred new industries, such as the water-powered spinning wheel for textiles, mining technologies for salt production, new kilns, ceramic and glazing techniques for porcelain and advances in sericulture, spinning and weaving in the silk industry.  By the end of the 11th century, the iron industry in northern China was producing 125,000 tons annually.  This iron output amounted to 3.5 to 4.3 pounds per person, a level of production that exceeded that of Western Europe until the Industrial Revolution seven centuries later.So robust was Sung China’s resource-based development that economic progress survived the Mongol conquest and continued during the subsequent Yuan Dynasty (1260 to 1368).  But, towards the end of the latter dynasty, the conditions for successful resource-based development had ended, and by the onset of the Black Death (1330 to 1370) and its aftermath, China embarked on a long period of economic decline.**The contemporary era** However, in the Contemporary Era from 1950 to present, many economies with abundant endowments of land, mineral and fossil fuel resources have had difficulty in achieving successful resource-based development.  There are signs that four large emerging market economies, Brazil, China, India and Russia – the so-called BRIC economies – are beginning to reap economy-wide benefits from exploiting their vast sources of land and natural resources.  But these economies are unusual compared to most developing countries because of the sheer scale of their populations, economies and resource endowments.  Although since the 1990s the economic growth performance of the BRIC countries has been impressive, it is unclear whether this growth is the result of successful and sustainable management of their large natural resource endowments, or simply due to the having such large endowments to command for economic development. Unfortunately, not many smaller resource-abundant economies have performed as well. For example, the economist Thorvaldur Gylfason has examined the long-run growth performance of 85 resource-rich developing economies since 1965.7 Only Botswana, Malaysia and Thailand managed to achieve a long-term investment rate exceeding 25% of GDP and long-run average annual growth rates exceeding 4%, which is a performance comparable to that of high income economies.  Malaysia and Thailand have also managed successfully to diversify their economies through re-investing the financial gains from primary production for export.  Botswana has yet to diversify its economy significantly but has developed favorable institutions and policies for managing its natural wealth and primary production for extensive economy-wide benefits.  Although many other **developing countries** still **depend** **on** finding new reserves or frontiers of land and other **natural resources to exploit**, very few appear to have benefited from such frontier-based development.  It appears that the Contemporary Era is a historical anomaly that poses an intriguing paradox:  Why should economic dependence on natural resource exploitation and frontier land expansion be associated with “unsustainable” resource-based development in many low and middle-income countries today, especially as historically this has not always been the case?

Since the aff principle denies currently developing countries the same opportunity to exploit their non intrinsic goods, affirming is inconsistent with the principle that moral rules regarding the use of non-intrinsic goods must apply fairly to all agents.

# 1NR Best Justification O/V

## (Short)

Framework debate is about which theory is better justified, not absolutely true. I need not deductively prove my ethical theory but merely show it’s better justified than any alternative. Framework arguments link back to different metastandards, so credence in one metadstandard should be indication a higher link is false if it’s one. This means defense on frameworks can’t trigger skepticism or presumption, because that only shows my framework isn’t 100% correct and debaters have to weigh between meta standards and links to the meta standards.

## (Long)

My burden is to the converse of the resolution is better justified than its affirmation. Prefer a best justification paradigm where the resolution is affirmed if its better justified than its negation:

**A)** Truth testing grants the negative an infinite variety of skeptical objections such as skepticism or prestandard arguments which explodes negative ground while holding the aff to perfection. For best justification a dropped pre-standards argument merely provides some evidence that a belief in the resolution is unjustified; the strength of that evidence depends on the strength of the argument. Ground is key to fairness because equal access to offense determines access to the ballot.

**B)** Comparative worlds harms philosophical literature and education by embedding a desirability evaluation of states of affairs that excludes deontology because it tests whether an action is consistent with maxims. Phil lit is key to education because it fosters critical thinking about normative questions.

Framework debate is about which theory is better justified, not absolutely true. I need not deductively prove my ethical theory but merely show it’s better justified than any alternative. This means defense on frameworks can’t trigger skepticism or presumption, because that only shows my framework isn’t 100% correct.

# 2NR FLs

## Ought=Should

Linguists concur should and ought are synonymous, referring to normative obligations. Cappelle and Sutter[[3]](#footnote-3)

As the following sentences demonstrate, ***should* and *ought*** *(to)* can be used as what **appear to be stylistic variants of each other** (1a, b), as **mutual paraphrases to strengthen each other’s meanin**g (2a, b), and, most remark- ably, in tag questions as proforms for verb phrases containing the other verb, a possibility pointed out by Harris (1986: 353), Palmer (1990: 122), Perkins (1983: 55) and Swan (1995: 496)—though note that, for reasons that will become clear, a tag with *shouldn’t* is more frequent than one with *oughtn’t* (3a, b):**Tina had** **no moral sense** about this question, **no feeling that children ought to** know who **their fathers** were **or should be fathered** by the men their mothers lived with or were married to. (British National Corpus (henceforth BNC), written dis- course)Check the quality of the paper. It **should** not be limp, shiny or waxy and the heavily printed areas **ought to** feel crisp and slightly rough. (Cobuild corpus, *Today* Newspaper) I’m not all that I **should** be and all that I **ought to** be, but by this time next year I’m going to be a bit better than I am just now, in spiritual terms. (BNC, spoken discourse) b. It is all very well setting goals—but what if the very idea causes psychological reversals, or the athlete’s logical mind says they **ought, should,** could do it while their emotional mind says it doesn’t want to? (Cobuild corpus, UK books) (3) a. Suppose I **ought to** tell him that **shouldn’t** I? (BNC, spoken discourse) b. And yes, we should be mindful of Muslims’ sensitivities. But such mindfulness really **should** run both ways, **oughtn’t** it? (<http://ace.mu.nu/archives/061590.php>) Such **examples** appear to **confirm** **the received opinion about** the modals ***should* and *ought t****o,* namely that **they are so similar in meaning** that **they can** typically **substitute for one another**. For instance, Palmer (1990: 122) writes, “It is not at all clear that (...) English makes any distinction be- tween should and ought to. They seem to be largely interchangeable.” **In Collins’s** (2009: 52-53) **summary of the literature,** **similar sentiments are expressed** by Coates (1983: 69), Quirk et al. (1985: 227) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 186).

## Turn O/V

The NC burden is about a moral rule applying fairly to all agents regardless of the place and time in and location regarding the use of non-intrinsic goods. The aff’s turns to the NC don’t apply because they are simply side affects of a bad consequences or action in which agents become incapable of following the moral rule- they do not bear on the applicability of the rule it self. Extinction doesn’t turn the NC- it just shows people would be unable to do what the rule prohibits, but that doesn’t show the rule isn’t fairly applied

## A2 NIBs Bad

He can turn the NC by showing the environment is an intrinsic good- via arguments from aesthetics or GE Moore’s intuition test to determine whether an object has value. They can also turn the NC by showing the moral rule applies fairly to all agents regarding the use of environmental goods.

## 2NR Apriori

Moral norms only validly govern the use of *intrinsic goods*. Only intrinsic goods can produce categorically binding moral judgments, since they commit one to pursuing ends that cannot be rationally abandoned. Goods that are only instrumentally valuable cannot produce binding constraints on action, since one can rationally abandon the ends for which the good is a means of achieving. For instance, if brushing my teeth is instrumentally good to my dental hygiene, I can give up that good by simply abandoning the end of caring for my dental hygiene—there is rational failure in my doing so. Thus, you negate, since the moral judgment that one ought to prioritize environmental protection over resource extraction is not a necessary rational requirement on action; non-intrinsic goods ought to be freely available for all who choose to pursue them.

# Framework Interaction

## A2 Util

The NC interacts with util in three ways:

A. pleasure and pain aren’t intrinsically valuable, or valuable in and of themselves- the only reason they’re good is because humans want it in the first place- that’s Hill 1- means that the AC framework begs the question and prefer the NC framework because I isolate intrinsic value.

B. reflective equilibrium is false- that argument just says we have intuitive beliefs and we try to reconcile them with moral imperatives by reaching some kind of middle ground but the diversity of answers and differences in views make reflective equilibrium impossible- that’s Hill 2

C. I coopt the warrants for extinction first- plurality of agents and moral uncertainty implies we must first recognize agents sociohistorical location- that’s Sandel

# Framework Weighing

## Morality =>Action Guiding

O/W

A. coopts his internal links- we both agree that morality should guide action, or else he wouldn’t have read a normative framework. I derive the requirement of a principle from the nature of morality itself, instead of a framework link chain so I coopt the shared assumption.

B. probability- the requirement is much more likely correct since I only need to win one link from morality being action guiding to the NC thesis, whereas he needs to win multiple links- each defensive argument on his link chain lowers the external probability of the entire theory being correct

## Atemporal Morality

O/W:

A. more likely to be relevant to agents because it accounts for unique sociohistorical factors- that means people will follow my theory instead of abiding by yours

B. accounts for the nature of moral reasoning and moral disagreement- takes out warrants for extinction first or preserving the species- the pluralism of views implies the NC framework, not the AC framework
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